		1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON	
3	PORTLAND DIVISION	
4		
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) 3:12-cv-02265-SI)
6	Plaintiff,))
7	v.) February 10, 2014)
8	THE CITY OF PORTLAND,)
9	Defendant.)) Portland, Oregon
10		, lorerana, oregon
11		
12		
13		
14	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
15	(Telephone Conference)	
16	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL H. SIMON	
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

2 **APPEARANCES** FOR THE PLAINTIFF: 1 2 Adrian Brown Bill Williams 3 United States Attorney's Office 1000 SW Third Avenue, Suite 600 Portland, OR 97204 5 Michelle Jones R. Jonas Alexander Geissler 6 U.S. Department of Justice Civil Rights Division 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW 7 Washington, DC 20530 8 FOR THE DEFENDANT CITY OF PORTLAND: 9 Ellen C. Osoinach Tracy Reeve 10 City of Portland Office of the City Attorney 11 1221 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 430 Portland, OR 97204 12 13 FOR THE DEFENDANT PORTLAND POLICE ASSOCIATION: 14 Anil Karia Tedesco Law Group 15 3021 NE Broadway Portland, OR 97232 16 FOR ENHANCED AMICUS CURIAE: 17 18 Shauna M. Curphey Curphey & Badger, P.A. 520 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1040 19 Portland, OR 97204 20 Jessica Ashlee Albies 21 Creighton & Rose, PC 815 SW Second Avenue, Suite 500 22 Portland, OR 97204 23 COURT REPORTER: Dennis W. Apodaca, RDR, RMR, FCRR, CRR 24 United States District Courthouse 1000 SW Third Avenue, Room 301 25 Portland, OR 97204

(February 10, 2014)

PROCEEDINGS

(In chambers; telephone conference:)

THE CLERK: Your Honor, this is the time set for a telephone conference in 12-cv-2265-SI, United States of America versus of City of Portland.

Counsel, there is a court reporter present.

Please be sure to state your name before you speak. Here is Judge Simon.

THE COURT: Good morning, everyone.

COUNSEL: Good morning.

THE COURT: I have been starting the process of going through the written submissions that have already been received from folks that both want to testify orally at the hearing and also those that did not ask to testify.

I understand that it was the United States that suggested that we have this telephone conference. So let me turn it over to the United States and ask what do you recommend we need to address in this conference.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. This is Adrian Brown for the United States.

Prior to getting on this call, just to let you know, all counsel did confer and discuss the matters that we would like to raise with you today. We have agreement on most everything and some additional questions.

The first matter we would like to address with you is in regard to those written comments. The Court's order for the fairness hearing requires the United States to put together a summary sheet of the comments and the presenters that submitted the comments and confer with counsel before submitting that to the Court.

The Court's order has the deadline for that to be submitted by tomorrow, the 11th. Given some need for additional time, getting the CD from the Court and discussing it amongst counsel, we would ask if we could have an extension of that deadline to provide it to the Court this Thursday at 9:00 a.m. We have conferred with the other counsel, and there is no objection to that request.

THE COURT: Of course. That's not a problem at all.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

So we plan on submitting to the Court what will essentially be a spreadsheet, after we confer with counsel, that will break up the comments by organization and by individuals. There will be many different columns with different categories and a summary of the testimony that the person has submitted. That order will provide the Court with some idea of how many comments are received and the extent of the timing of the hearing.

So that brings us to our next issue, which is the timing. We did a rough calculation of the amount of time that the various commenters would need based upon each individual having five minutes and each organization having up to three representatives with ten minutes each. Based on our rough calculations thus far, we have come up with approximately 12 hours of testimony. That does not incorporate breaks or time for shuffling people around.

So we wanted to talk to you about how the Court would like to set the timing of the hearing. In essence, we could have it start at 9:00 a.m., and the Court mentioned it would go until it is all over. But does the Court have an expectation at this point in time as to how long the Court is willing to go for a day and whether or not the Court would be breaking this up into two days?

THE COURT: I would like to hear the parties' preferences, but the Court has the ability and willingness to go 24/7. By the way, the court reporter just gave me a funny look. (Laughter)

So I think it might be useful to arrange for a second court reporter. Maybe what we can is essentially go maybe two or three hours with one court reporter. Then maybe if I don't take much of a break, five minutes or so every now and then, but that way we can have a second court reporter come in. The people in my opinion who

really, really need a significant break of more than five minutes is the court reporter.

Myself and our staff can handle a five-minute break every now and then. Frankly, I think counsel can handle that as well. If anybody wants to break more frequently or a bit longer, you are welcome to ask for it, and I will give it to you. I think the only one I need to make sure we can give appropriate breaks to is my court reporter, and we will make sure we will have a second reporter lined up.

MS. BROWN: Okay. So if we were to start at 9:00 a.m., then it is the Court's intention to go that day until everyone has had the opportunity that they want?

THE COURT: I do want to play it by ear, and sometimes I do this with jury trials. When I ask the jury whether they want to keep going after 5:00 or come back the next morning at a certain time, maybe even early, if it looks like we are going to have difficulties getting things done by 5:00 or 6:00 p.m., then maybe perhaps early afternoon I may have ask the folks who have not yet testified, by a show of hands: Are there folks who would rather go and wait until the evening and make sure it gets done today or maybe folks would rather come back tomorrow. Maybe take my cue from maybe what the majority of the folks in the room say.

Again, right now is the perfect time for me to hear all the opinions from our four parties.

MS. BROWN: Absolutely. The United States is certainly open to extend it into a second day, if that's necessary. As far as counsel coming in from Washington, D.C. and local counsel, we have a second day available if the Court wants to do that.

Just talking to the parties, it appears that everyone, all the parties except AMA -- AMA has some logistical issues with going into a second day with one of their counsel having a deposition scheduled. But other than that, I think we are open to whatever the Court feels is appropriate.

THE COURT: Again, I will hear from AMA and the City and the Portland Police Association in a moment. I think that we should make this decision pretty much once we get the facts on the ground, by early to mid-afternoon. If we think we can finish by 5:00 or 6:00 or 7:00, I definitely think we should do that.

If it looks like it is not likely to be able to finish, unless we go to significantly after six o'clock or so, then I will ask counsel for the parties present as well as the people who have not yet testified what their preferences are.

But, also, realize that your 12-hour assumption

too.

assumes that everyone will take their full five minutes or the organizations will take their full 30. That may or may not be correct. We really won't know that until the day of hearing.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Very well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do any other parties want to be heard on this issue now before we move on to another issue?

MS. CURPHEY: This is Shauna Curphey with the AMA Coalition. I think between Ashlee, my co-counsel, it might be one of us one day and one of us the other day, and that's how we will have to proceed.

MS. ALBIES: I think my deposition is scheduled for 1:00 p.m. If we do run over, it sounds like we would reconvene in the morning, and that would be preferable than going later and then resume in the morning.

THE COURT: Yes. My plan would be that we would start up again at 9:00 a.m. the next morning. I have many things on my calendar, but we can move or postpone those.

MS. OSOINACH: Your Honor, Ellen Osoinach.

The City is flexible. We can play it by ear.

MR. KARIA: ON behalf of PPA, we are flexible

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. BROWN: The next topic, Your Honor, in

regards to how the public will be notified of both their time coming to an end, whether it be five minutes or ten minutes and how they will be notified as far as when they will be expected to testify. So to take the first question, many of us are familiar with City Council. It has a light and a buzzer that tells people when they are up. We all know the Ninth Circuit has that ability, but we weren't sure what the Court's ability was for notifying individuals and if there was any thought into that.

THE COURT: Sure. We do not have the technological ability of either the City or the Ninth Circuit, so we are going to go the old-fashioned way. Our courtroom deputy, at my direction, will hold up two cards. One card will say "one minute remaining," and the second card will say "time expired" or "stop" or something that is phrased appropriately like that.

Does anyone have any comments on that approach?

MS. BROWN: That's fine for the United States.

THE COURT: By the way, does anybody have any suggestions as to what's the right way to say stop in this circumstance? "Time expired"? "Stop" seems so harsh.

MS. OSOINACH: That works for the City.

MS. ALBIES: A loud buzzing noise maybe or a bell or a gavel. (Laughter)

THE COURT: We will work on it. We may bring in

an air horn. We will work it out.

MS. BROWN: Then as far as the testimony of individuals, the fairness hearing order sets out some procedures but we wanted to make sure that we were all understanding of any additional procedures. The way the order reads from Document 53, page 4, is that the individuals will come to the courthouse and check in with Mary, or other courtroom deputies, sign in to let the Court know they are there and ready to testify. The Court's order also says that those who have submitted written comments will be given priority for testifying.

So we were just wondering if there were any other procedures that the Court anticipated following and people signing up and whether or not people will kind of know what order they are in so they can decide whether they want to leave for an hour and come back.

THE COURT: Sure. You mentioned Docket 53. I noticed this morning, I don't think we have actually filed my signed order setting notice and procedure for fairness hearing in CM/ECF. All we have is the Government's stipulated motion, which we took in large part, but not completely.

So unless I'm mistaken, we will get that put on $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CM/ECF}}$ later today.

MS. BROWN: I thought Docket 53 was the filed

version, but I could be wrong.

THE COURT: Let me check. I'm really not sure. We will double-check.

In any event, what I plan on having, we have two externs here who will assist Mary, our courtroom deputy, in staffing a table at the entrance to the courtroom on the 13th floor. We should have some signage on the first floor.

Adrian, can I ask you to take care of that, to have some type of signage in the lobby of the courthouse, after people clear security, that says the name of the case; fairness hearing, proceed to 13th floor,

Courtroom 13B. We will staff a table right outside

Courtroom 13B with a sign-up sheet. I am going to be consistent with my order. So we're not taking people in the order they sign up that morning, but we want to know who is there. I will compare that with our list of written testimony.

Then when I take the bench, after some preliminary comments, I will announce who will be testifying, who we will be hearing from in the first half of the morning session, in the second half of the morning session, and then probably update that midway through, and then let folks know who we will be hearing from in the afternoon session.

MS. BROWN: I think that will be very helpful.

The parties, when we discussed this, had just a variety of different thoughts on that. So that works for the United States.

THE COURT: By the way, anybody else is free to make a comment, if you wish.

MS. BROWN: The only other questions we have about the individuals coming up to testify are whether or not there would be any translators available. So far we have not received any comments in Spanish, but I know that the Court's order must open the ability for people to come, even if they did submit comments. When we were doing community interviews, there were individuals that we spoke to that spoke Spanish, and we needed translators for them. I don't know if that's something the Court has thought about or how we would like to handle that.

THE COURT: I don't think we have seen any written requests to have a translator available. In terms of the economics involved, I don't want to have to pay for an interpreter to be present all day if that interpreter is not needed. So I'm going to take the position that since no one has yet specifically asked for interpretive services from the Court, we're not going to provide any. Obviously if someone asks for it specifically, for a specific witness, we will see what we can do. We

certainly do have a staff interpreter who speaks Spanish available to us.

Let me ask probably Ms. Curphey or Ms. Albies, are you aware of any folks who are coming in that will need interpretation services?

MS. CURPHEY: We are not aware of anybody that needs an interpreter at this time.

THE COURT: Okay. I am going to be very informal on that. If someone comes in with their own personal interpreter -- maybe someone wants to give their story, but doesn't speak English well and wants to have a friend speak for them, I don't have a problem with that.

MS. CURPHEY: Okay, Your Honor. We will relay that to the AMA Coalition, who may field questions about this.

MS. BROWN: Another option for another resource, Your Honor, is that the United States Attorney's Office has a contract with a language services company that we use for callers who call our office and don't speak English. So that's another option. We could bring that service in by phone as another option.

THE COURT: Excellent. If we do have someone that we didn't anticipate, we at least have that opportunity. Excellent.

MS. BROWN: I did have one other matter

regarding individuals testifying. So far in the submissions we have been reviewing, there have been some individuals that have submitted comments as an individual and then different and separate comments as a representative for the organization.

For those persons that overlap, rather than having them come up and down twice before the Court, we discussed this amongst the parties that we are all agreeable to having those individuals testify at one time. They can provide both information to the Court at that time in their individual view and in their view as a representative for an organization, if that would be agreeable to the Court, and limit them to the ten minutes that an organization would have.

THE COURT: That seems fair to me.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Moving on to counsel's presentation, it appears that each party, except for the AMA -- just to let everyone know, we are getting some feedback on this end. Is everyone able to hear me okay without feedback?

THE COURT: The Court can hear you fine.

MS. BROWN: Okay. Forgive me if I'm kind of hesitating, because I am getting some feedback here.

But it appears that each party's counsel has a presentation to make, except for the PPA, and we just

wanted to give the Court an idea of what each party is planning on presenting for their counsel presentations and for potential witnesses.

THE COURT: Do you want to do that at the fairness hearing on the 18th?

MS. BROWN: Yes. We would like to do that in the beginning, basically make opening remarks. Our presentation would consist of some brief opening comments about our role in this matter, the United States' role, and then we have some slides, demonstrative aids. We would ask if the Court can do this -- I think I have seen the Court do this before -- have a big screen available so the public can see the slide at the same time the Court is seeing them. We basically have some slides we would like to go through that would help educate the Court and the public about the process we engaged in prior to getting to this point and the type of public engagement that we took on.

Then we also have our police practices expert that provided assistance during the investigation. He is a retired police chief, Charles Gruber. We would ask him to testify in a very limited capacity as to the types of investigation he participates in and how, in his opinion, the settlement agreement meets the remedies sought from the complaint. That, in total, would last, we estimate,

an hour or less from the United States.

There are two other potential experts that aren't experts for the DOJ, but they are experts in the mental health field that may testify. We are still conferring with the two individuals. One would be Chris Bouneff, who is the executive director for NAMI Oregon. The other would be either Maggie Bennington-Davis or Darryl Walker, who are the leaders of Cascadia Behavioral Health. So those two we haven't figured out whether or not they would be providing public comments orally or written comments or come in for a brief question and answer session. So we're still working on those two.

With respect to all of that, that would take an hour, or slightly more than an hour, for the United States.

THE COURT: All right. Let me give you my comments.

Mary, do we have the large screen that comes down from the ceiling in our courtroom?

THE CLERK: Yes.

THE COURT: Let's make sure we have got your slides tested so we can make sure that works. It is fine with me to have both our television screen, which is in the back of the courtroom, but it is only like three-by-four, or something. We will bring down the large

screen. The people that can see that the best are those in the jury box. But members in the audience, depending on where they are sitting, can see that large screen moderately well. Let's make sure we've worked out all of the logistics on that, and that's fine with me.

With respect to Mr. Gruber testifying, do you envision he would be speaking from a podium addressing the Court, or would you rather see him on the witness stand where he would be more visible to the audience?

MS. BROWN: We would prefer to have him on the witness stand and have him be visible to the audience, and the Court, with a limited inquiry from counsel to direct his statements and his exam.

At the same time, we discussed with counsel a stipulation that any parties' witnesses would not be subject to cross-examination. There are some other witnesses that the other parties are bringing forward, along with the public, who won't be cross-examined. We have discussed having a stipulation that the witnesses wouldn't be crossed. Certainly we anticipate keeping his testimony limited.

THE COURT: By the way, speaking of the podium,

I am wondering if it might make the most sense to place
the podium not so it is facing the Court, with counsel's
back to the audience, but if you visualize the courtroom,

maybe have the podium so the speaker's back is to the jury box, which will most likely be empty. That way, with a roughly 90-degree sweep, counsel can speak to the Court and also to the members of the public.

What do you think of that idea?

MS. BROWN: The United States thinks that's a great idea.

MS. ALBIES: I think that's a great idea.

THE COURT: How we normally want the podium for opening and closing, which by the way, is a terrible idea. Please don't use a podium for openings and closings in a jury trial, but that's my two cents.

But let's take that podium and then switch it around so it is facing the other way so the back is facing the jury box. That way, they can easily look at the Court and also the members of the public. Then we can still use the PA system, the microphone system, that works with that podium. We can do that.

Let me also note two more points I wanted to make, and then I will turn it over to anybody else.

When you say there is no cross-examination by the parties, that's fine with me. But I reserve the right to question any witness, whether it be on the stand, if I think it needs clarification, like Mr. Gruber, or I do plan on asking on occasion follow-up questions from some

of our people who give testimony. I am going to do my best not to intimidate anybody, but it might be helpful to ask some follow-up questions. I don't want anybody to be surprised if I do that.

MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. I do need to note, in the interest of disclosure, the AMA still does need to talk with their clients about not crossing Chuck Gruber or any other witnesses that the City puts on. So I want to put that caveat out there. I won't be speaking for the AMA.

THE COURT: That's fine. My last point on this issue, and then I will turn it over to the other folks. Although what you say is fine with me, in terms of the process, I just want to make my observation that I believe most of the members of the public who are going to make the effort to come to this fairness hearing are doing it because, more importantly, they want to be heard and have their story heard as opposed to they want to hear information and hear what either the United States or the City or the police association or the AMA has to say.

That's just my opinion. I could be wrong. But I believe they are coming primarily because they want to be heard, and they feel they have got something to say.

That said, I think it would behoove us all if the United States did not spend more than an hour, and,

frankly, if you could cut it down, I think it would be better, so that we don't look like we are in any way filibustering or making people wait an unduly long period of time for people who feel they have got something on their chest that want to get off, and I don't want to make them wait too long.

MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. We will take another look at everything and keep that in mind and do our best to reduce the time.

THE COURT: Because you have got two audiences here obviously. One is me, because I have to make a fairness decision, but I can learn a lot by reading and have learned a lot by reading. I will also give you the opportunity to submit comments by our March 11th date.

Then if you want additional oral argument after that, let me know. Otherwise, I will receive your post-hearing briefs by March 11. So I can learn a lot of what you need to communicate to me in that fashion as well.

So to some extent, to the extent that you plan on speaking to the members of the public in your presentation, although I'm positive what you want to say is valuable and important for them to hear, I am concerned that they may get frustrated if they are made to wait too long.

MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone from either the City or police association or Albina Ministries Coalition want to make any comments on anything we have talked about so far?

MS. CURPHEY: This is Shauna Curphey for the AMA Coalition. We want to clarify that counsel for AMA Coalition doesn't plan on making a presentation other than to introduce our clients who intend to speak on their own behalf. I am assuming they will walk up to the podium and make their presentation as if they were testifying as a member of the public.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MS. CURPHEY: That will look different than the DOJ or the City's presentation who plan to put witnesses on the stand. I wanted to make that clear.

THE COURT: That's fine. Let me ask, with the AMA and the Portland Police Association -- I don't know if you are going to have any witnesses from your association, Mr. Karia -- but if you do, would you prefer them to go earlier in the process or later in the day?

MR. KARIA: Thank you, Judge. This is
Mr. Karia. We do not plan on having any witnesses or
presentation. If we do, frankly, we will go with the flow
based on how the hearing is proceeding.

THE COURT: Okay. And Shauna or Ashlee, do you

want the AMA witnesses to go first, early in the process?

In the morning? Later in the day? What preferences do

you have?

MS. ALBIES: This is Ashlee Albies. We had intended, instead of counsel presentation, we understood the DOJ and the City would be making counsel presentations and maybe putting on a witness in the initial part of the morning. We had anticipated that counsel would be introducing the three speakers from the AMA Coalition who would then make a presentation. We are going to confine it to ten minutes each. We can certainly try to cut that down for the three individuals who are going to speak on behalf of the AMA Coalition, which will be making the Coalition's presentation and their position to the Court and to the members of the public.

THE COURT: All right. That sounds fine.

Let me, Ms. Osoinach, do you plan on calling witnesses for the City or making counsel presentation on behalf of the City?

MS. OSOINACH: Yes, we did. Honestly, given your comments, I am rethinking that, as probably is the United States. One of the things that might help me is to ask you a question: Are you envisioning that there will be a continuing sign-up? So in other words, are you expecting that any member of the public that wishes to

testify needs to be at the courthouse promptly at 9:00 a.m. to sign up, or are you envisioning that people will filter in throughout the day, and there will be a continuing sign-up?

THE COURT: The latter. My experience, and I have limited experience, but I have some experience with homeless/mentally ill. Frankly, back when I was in private practice, as a pro bono counsel, I represented some folks that fit in that category. It is very difficult for them, I'd say, it is fairly difficult for them to really get to some place by a specific time. So I do plan on allowing folks that come in later to still testify. But my plan would be, if you came in later, you are probably going to be testifying near the end.

Does anybody disagree with that approach?

MS. OSOINACH: No, I don't. I assumed that was sort of the plan.

THE COURT: Yes. By the way, I do hope the City does make a presentation. I think it is an excellent idea for the U.S. Department of Justice to make an opening presentation, followed by the City, and then we can go into the AMA's approach the way it has just been described. Obviously if the Portland Police Association wanted to make a presentation, they are certainly welcome.

I think that's all an excellent idea and an

excellent way to start. I was just having some concerns, if we have a lot of people that show up at 9:00 a.m., making them wait a significant period of time before they speak. But I definitely do not want to discourage the United States or the City or AMA or even the police association to make opening comments if they want to. I think that's an excellent way to start.

MS. OSOINACH: Your Honor, the City's intent, to be perfectly blunt, is that the majority of the comments, if not all of them, are critical of the settlement agreement. So I think in weighing the two audiences, you and the public, given the fact that the entire public might not be there right there at the start, when the City envisions making that presentation, the utility of reaching that audience is minimal, although certainly I think the press will be there, and they will get out a larger picture for the audience.

The City's concern is largely in framing the issue for the Court in terms of talking about what the City has done so far in implementing the settlement agreement, even if it had not been an order of the Court, presenting evidence about the implementation and the effects on the ground to help both you and the public understand the reasonableness and adequacy, as we have implemented it thus far.

So that's sort of our envisioning of the presentation. I think I would be comfortable with you working in the City's presentation, knowing that's the contents, in whatever way you felt works best for the presentation. So, for example, if you have 30 people there at 9:00 a.m., and you want to get started with the public testimony, I would not have any objection to allowing that testimony to happen in the morning and then say we will hear from the City or the DOJ in the afternoon. I don't feel like the City's presentation, although I think it would help to frame the issue, I don't think it has to happen in the beginning.

THE COURT: All right. I think that's helpful.

I will play it by ear. I do think hearing from the City
and from the United States early on will help frame the
issues.

Did I hear you say that the City's presentation will be critical of the settlement agreement?

MS. OSOINACH: No. The City has observed that the majority of the comments that were submitted to the Court have been critical of the settlement agreement.

THE COURT: I agree with that. I'm glad I misheard what you said.

MS. OSOINACH: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, just a few evidentiary matters to cover, and then I think I will be done with the list from the United States.

The first is that we talked to the parties about stipulating to authenticity of factual documents that the parties plan on submitting. At this point in time, the only document that the United States plans on submitting as part of a factual record is the findings letter, which I know is already in possession of the Court. That's what Chuck Gruber will be testifying about, in addition to the complaint. So we just wanted to let the Court know that the parties have stipulated to the authenticity and admissibility of that document.

The City informed us that they may have one or two documents, but they are still looking into that. AMA told us that they don't anticipate having documents, but will get back to us as well. And the PPA doesn't anticipate having any documents.

Then in regards to other evidentiary matters, we briefly discussed with you, I believe in our last status conference, the possibility of raising continuing objection. We don't want to interrupt people. I know the order provides that the parties may object, may raise evidentiary objections, but we would like to ask the Court to basically enter an order of continuing objections from

the United States in regards to relevance.

The Court's order talks about how the testimony must be relevant. The cumulative nature of testimony, while we understand many people are going to be testifying, and we want as many people there possible testifying. We are more referring to that objection as to individuals themselves providing evidence that this is cumulative.

Hearsay, we do anticipate obviously a lot of that, but we don't want to raise objections throughout the hearing on that. We would like to address that as a continuing objection.

Any testimony that's argumentative, we would like to raise a continuing objection.

Even though none of us -- we have conferred with counsel. None of us anticipate settlement privileged discussions to come out under Rule 408, but as a precautionary measure, we would like that noted by the Court as well as a continuing objection.

And personal knowledge, we want to make sure that, of course, people are testifying to their personal knowledge.

THE COURT: All right. Although the personal knowledge is modified by the lay opinion rule. A lot of matters that might not be within personal knowledge might

be within the subject of lay opinion.

Does anybody have any objection or disagreement with that approach?

objections by all four parties. So all four parties will have continuing evidentiary objections under the Federal Rules of Evidence, I would say including, but not limited to relevance, cumulative testimony, 403, hearsay, argumentative comments, settlement and all attorney-client privilege, and lack of personal knowledge or other foundation. Then to the extent that you want to spell out what testimony should be either stricken or disregarded in response to a continuing objection, you can do that in your written briefing that will be filed on March 11th.

Does anybody have any objections to that approach? Hearing none.

MS. BROWN: Not by the United States.

MS. OSOINACH: No objection for the City.

THE COURT: Ms. Albies or Ms. Curphey?

Mr. Karia?

MS. ALBIES: For the AMA Coalition, no objection.

25 THE COURT: Mr. Karia?

```
MR. KARIA: No objection, Your Honor.
 1
                          I will enter that order of
 2
              THE COURT:
 3
    continuing objections for all four parties.
 4
              MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor. Then the
 5
    final matter on the United States' list was that
    Mr. Gruber will be testifying, of course, without an
 6
 7
    expert. He hasn't been discovered, given that this matter
 8
    was resolved to any formal discovery process. The parties
9
    conferred on that, and they agreed to that stipulation
10
    that he may testify without discovery of an expert report.
11
              THE COURT: Very good. All right.
12
              MS. BROWN: I believe that's all for the
13
    United States.
14
              THE COURT: All right. Anything else from the
15
    City?
16
              MS. OSOINACH: Nothing further from the City.
17
              THE COURT: Anything from the police
    association?
18
19
              MR. KARIA: No, Your Honor.
20
              THE COURT: Anything further from Albina
21
    Ministries Coalition?
22
              MS. ALBIES: Yes, Your Honor.
                                              This is
23
    Ms. Albies.
24
              I have a question. This is in terms if the
25
    Court has any sort of -- and this is more curiosity. I
```

understand it is the Court's discretion about when to enter testimony into the record.

Do you have any thoughts about how you plan to do that?

THE COURT: I'm not clear on exactly what you are asking.

MS. ALBIES: I believe the order that was entered said the Court will receive testimony, and it would be entered at the Court's discretion into the record. So people who have submitted written testimony, will the Court kind of be reviewing that and decide whether that will be entered into the record? And if so, whether they show up to testify or not, do you have any thoughts on how the Court will be entering that into the record, whether it will be published on ECF or be made public in any other way?

THE COURT: Good question. My thinking is, I would rather defer that to the parties. Here is my thinking: I will hear and read what I need to hear and what I need to read in order to make my decision on the fairness hearing. The only purpose of having a record, I think, is for appellate purposes; at least that's the primary purpose.

So I will be glad to receive into the record anything that any of the four parties believes should be

put into the record for appellate purposes, but I was not really planning in going through the written testimony that I have received already in deciding what should be part of the written record or the Court record and what shouldn't be.

My expectation is to issue a brief opinion and order on this. I'll strike the word "brief." My plan is to write an appropriate opinion and order on this. I will refer to whatever factual record I think is relevant to understand the reasoning that the Court has gone through in that opinion and order.

I don't think it is necessary for me to put certain things into the record for that purpose. If anyone disagrees, please tell me your opinion. Otherwise, my plan would be to simply invite the parties, whether it be before the hearing, after the hearing, or in the context of their March 11th filing, to ensure that the record has whatever the parties believe the record should have.

Anyone have a better approach or different approach?

COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We heard a few people say "yes." The record is not reflecting anything to the contrary.

By the way, I want to let you know one more thing. We had a request, and I don't remember which organization did this. Mary, perhaps you do.

There may be one or two people that might not have government-issued photo ID. We received sort of an inquiry and a proposal of what to do about that.

Mary, who did that request come from?

THE CLERK: I think it was the American Mental Health Association. It was a local mental health organization. I can find the exact name.

THE COURT: I think we sent you copies of our response. We copied the parties?

THE CLERK: Yes.

MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: The Marshals Service here would really prefer us to not have very many people that try to enter this building without government-issued photo ID, but if there are going to be a couple, we are taking steps to try to make sure they can get in. We have accepted the proposal from this one organization that they will take photographs of people that they know want to come in and who do not have a government-issued photo ID, send us their names, their photographs, and we will have them on the list for the courtroom security officers down on the first floor of the courthouse. We need those photographs

and that list of names by the close of business on Wednesday, the week before our hearing. I think that's two days from now.

I don't want to advertise this too much. I don't want too many people that come without government-issued photo IDs. But if any of you know of people who are planning on coming and don't have or refuse to get government-issued photo IDs, this is how we are planning on dealing with it. I would really like to keep that number at a minimum. That's at the request of the U.S. Marshals Service.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Your Honor.

We have one other question. This may be more directed to Mary, if Your Honor concurs in that request. We really appreciate the Court getting us the DVDs as quickly as possible and gathering that information. One of the issues that we realize when we got the CD of the written testimony was that there are some people that noted that they submitted a DVD, video testimony, and I just wanted to ask the Court how the Court plans on handling that as far as whether both showing the DVDs during the fairness hearing and also allowing counsel access to those before this hearing or after this hearing.

THE COURT: Let me ask Mary or Nicholle, I have not seen any DVDs.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE CLERK: People have asked can they, and we have told them they can. I told them when they needed to have that to us by, but we haven't gotten anything. THE COURT: Who is talking? MS. BROWN: This is Adrian Brown. THE COURT: Did you say that some people actually have submitted DVDs? MS. BROWN: We're looking at that. MR. WILLIAMS: Lisa Haynes said she would like her son to submit a DVD. THE CLERK: He has not submitted one yet. I have been in contact with her and told her that he could. I haven't received anything yet. She said she would let me know. MR. WILLIAMS: It is possible that people could walk in the door with DVDs. THE COURT: My plan would be to ask how long the DVD is. If it is a reasonable length, plan on showing it right then and there. By "reasonable length," my presumption is any oral testimony and DVD should really be limited to five minutes per individual witness. MS. BROWN: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: If an individual comes in and says, "I would like to give you five minutes of my testimony and five minutes from my son, " my plan is to say "fine." If

they want to say, "I would like to give you an hour DVD from my son," I don't think I am going to play it right then and there.

MS. BROWN: Right.

MS. CURPHEY: I think the AMA Coalition, at their community meetings, has taken videotaped testimony for people. I thought that DVD has been submitted, but obviously it hasn't. So I know at least some testimony that has been videotaped for people by the AMA Coalition. I don't know its length.

THE COURT: As far as we know, we have not received any DVDs. If you could check back with those folks, my guess is you will probably learn they were planning to bring it to the Court. If you could just inquire.

Could we get a list of the names of witnesses who are testifying on the video and approximately how long each testimony is. But if they think they have already turned it in to us, we don't have it.

MS. CURPHEY: I will clarify that. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Let me ask all of you, because you have done a lot of these public hearings in this context before this, does anyone anticipate any particular disruptions that I should anticipate? I'm not asking for

names of potential people who might be disruptive. But what sort of disruptions might I anticipate, if any?

MS. BROWN: Your Honor, this is Adrian Brown for the United States. The United States has done a variety of both private council and phone conferences. The only interruptions that we have seen — there have been some crowd noise here and there, which is nothing to be too shocked about. There have been some individuals who appear to have mental illness that may interrupt more loudly and more individually. But other than that, there hasn't been anything that caused, at least in our settings, a security concern. It has been more verbal outbursts.

ensure that anyone who makes a verbal outburst is advised that they certainly can provide oral testimony, and I want to hear what they have to say. But I want to hear what everyone has to say, and so I would ask them to not have any more outbursts while other people are talking so we can hear what those folks have to say. Similarly, I will assure them, when they are talking, I will make sure that no one interrupts them.

We will play that by ear. That's helpful. Thank you.

All right. Anything else anyone wants to talk

about now?

MS. OSOINACH: Your Honor, the only other disruption that is fairly typical is clapping or showing support for whoever is testifying. I don't know how you want to deal with that, but that's fairly typical that the audience will clap.

THE COURT: I think if it is done in the middle of some testimony, I will urge the audience to refrain and wait until that person is done speaking so as not to take away from that person's time, because they are limited to five minutes. But if someone wants to have brief clapping after someone is done speaking, I'm not going to stop that.

MS. ALBIES: We have nothing further for this hearing, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I found this all very helpful.

Thank you very much. If anyone needs to speak with us before the 18th, just let Mary know, and we will get on the phone with you.

COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

(End of proceedings.)

--000--I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause. A transcript without an original signature, conformed signature, or digitally signed signature is not certified. /s/ Dennis W. Apodaca December 30, 2014 DENNIS W. APODACA, RDR, RMR, FCRR, CRR DATE Official Court Reporter